

**REMARKS**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 through 8 and 10 through 18 in the Advisory action (Paper No. 11) because "applicant's proposed amendments require further searches and substantial consideration and review of the application. Applicant's proposed amendments may also introduce new matter into the application."

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's unwillingness to enter the proposed amendments and consider the claims for allowance.

In the Examiner's previous Office action (Paper No. 7) dated January 5, 1999, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 through 18 because they contained the phrase "bearing a bore". This has been removed by the most recent Response by Applicant. Applicant contends that "a bore" was never presented in any of the specification or the drawings and therefore has been removed and should not be grounds for a new search, new matter, or new reconsideration.

✓  
The Examiner in Paper No. 7 rejected Claims 1 through 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph because of a quote from the Remarks section. This quote in the Remarks section was not stated in the claims and was brought to the attention of the Examiner that it was erroneous. Discussing this sentence from the specification will not introduce any new matter into the specification or require a new search or new consideration.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 through 18 because it is unclear whether there is one or two printed circuit boards. As stated in the previous Remarks section, there are actually two printed circuit boards. This was made clear in the previous set of claims before amending them before final Office action. The two circuit boards were claimed "a printed circuit board" and "a printed circuit board assembly". This language was used in Claims 1, 6, and 12. Thus, from the claims, even before the final Office action, it was made clear that there were two circuit boards, one called "a printed circuit board assembly" and thus there was no confusion. In the most recent Response, Applicant has changed this terminology to "a first printed circuit board" and "a second printed circuit board". There has only been a change in terminology and there is no change based on the merits of the case.

The fact that the Examiner has brought up the issue whether or not there is one or two printed circuit boards present in the invention should itself be an indication that the Examiner should have prepared and searched for both scenarios of whether there was one or two printed circuit board present. Therefore, this issue should not bring up any new matter or new consideration or new searches.

Also, Applicant kindly points out on page 5 of the specification, lines 13-14 state that "flexible printed circuit board 46", while line 19 states "printed circuit board 10". Turning to the drawings, flexible printed circuit board 46 is shown in Fig. 3 and printed circuit board 10 is shown in Fig. 4. Thus, it is clear from the drawings and specification that there are always two printed circuit boards, one being a flexible printed circuit board and another being a printed circuit board. It should not

matter whether they call one "a printed circuit board" or another one "a printed circuit board" assembly or call one "a first printed circuit board" and another "a second printed circuit board". This is just a matter of terminology and not something that goes to the merits of the case.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his statement regarding that new matter has been added to the claims and the specification as a result of our proposed amendments.


Lastly, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1 through 8 and 10 through 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 over Takagi *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,508,860 or Morehouse *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,768,049 in view of Kaufman *et al.* U.S. Patent No. 5,199,884. As discussed in the Remarks section of the Applicant's earlier filed Amendment, neither of these reference discuss two pairs of connectors simultaneously coming into contact with each other automatically when the printed circuit board 10 is mated with the head disk assembly 20. Although the word "automatically" was added in the most recent proposed amendments, it is brought to the Examiner's attention that in the claims as originally filed, independent Claims 1, 6 and 12, have the word "automatically" in them and they were therefore already present in the original application as filed.

For these reasons, no new matter has been introduced and there should be no reconsideration necessary and there should be no need for a further search.

In view of the foregoing arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition to be passed to issue. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's attorney.

A Petition for first extension of time to and through the 5<sup>th</sup> of May 1999 and the incurred fee of \$110.00 accompany this Amendment. Should the Petition become lost or separated, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this paragraph as the requisite written petition, and to charge Deposit Account No. 02-4943 of Applicant's undersigned attorney in such amount.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Robert E. Bushnell  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 638-5740

Folio: P54596  
Date: 4/27/99  
I.D.: REB/kf